

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 17-6065

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MOSTAFA AHMED AWWAD,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief District Judge. (2:14-cr-00163-RBS-LRL-1; 2:16-cv-00643-RBS)

Submitted: May 23, 2017

Decided: May 26, 2017

Before KING, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mostafa Ahmed Awwad, Appellant Pro Se. Joseph Evan DePadilla, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, Kevin Patrick Hudson, Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News, Virginia, Heather M. Schmidt, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mostafa Ahmed Awwad seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Awwad has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny the pending motion for a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED